



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/091,237	03/04/2002	Hong Su	10013661-1	7188

7590 07/12/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

STEVENS, ROBERT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/091,237

Applicant(s)

SU ET AL.

Examiner

Robert M. Stevens

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 4/26/2005 to the original application filed 3/4/2002 by Su et al. entitled "Transform between source and target xml schemas".
2. The Office withdraws all non-prior art objections and rejections raised in the First Action on the Merits (FAOM), in view of the amendment (i.e., specification, 35 USC 112 1st and 2nd paragraphs).
3. The Office substantially maintains the FAOM rejections of claims 1, 3-15, 18 and 20-26 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Jeong, in view of the amendment, with modifications to accommodate any corresponding claim variance between the FAOM and amendment.
4. The Office substantially maintains the FAOM rejections of claims 2, 17 and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeong in view of Geiger, in view of the amendment, with modifications to accommodate any corresponding claim variance between the FAOM and amendment.
5. The Office substantially maintains the FAOM rejection of claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeong in view of Oracle9i, in view of the amendment, with

modifications to accommodate any corresponding claim variance between the FAOM and amendment.

6. Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1, 10 and 18 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

8. **Claims 1, 3-15, 18 and 20-26 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a)** as being anticipated by Eunja Jeong et al (“Induction of Integrated View for XML Data with Heterogeneous DTDs”, CIKM ‘01, Nov. 5-10, 2001, ACM 1-581 (13-436-3/01/0011), pp. 151-158, hereafter referred to as “Jeong”).

Regarding independent claim 1, Jeong discloses:

A method of document transformation comprising:

a) modeling a source XML document corresponding source schema source tree having a plurality of source nodes; (p. 153 Table 4 re: row 1 and DTD “eg1”)

b) modeling a target XML document corresponding target schema nodes; (p. 153 Table 4 re: row 1 and DTD “eg2”) and

c) generating a sequence of transformation operations that transforms said source tree to said target tree. (p. 151 re: “(2) ... generate a set of tree grammar rules”)

Regarding claim 3, which is dependent upon claim 1, Jeong further discloses:

wherein c) comprises:

matching said plurality of source nodes to said plurality of target nodes.
(p. 155, 3.2.2 Tree Matrix, re: “use of a ... matching method between two trees”)

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent upon claim 1, Jeong further discloses:

wherein c) comprises:

automatically generating said sequence of transformation operations. (p. 151 re: “(2) ... generate a set of tree grammar rules”)

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent upon claim 1, Jeong further discloses:

d) for each source node in said source schema, selecting a plurality of candidate nodes in said target schema that are possible matches; (p. 155 1st sentence below Fig. 4 “with all possible matchings ... identified”)

e) for each source node in said source schema, generating a transforming to each of said plurality of candidate nodes; (p. 155 3rd sentence below Fig. 4 “The second step is to compute the minimum number of operations ...”) *and*

f) for each source node in said source schema, selecting one of said plurality of node transformation sequences, a selected node transformation sequence, for said sequence of transformation operations that is associated with a least cost of data loss. (p. 155, 3.2.2 Tree matrix, especially the two paragraphs below Fig. 4 discussing computing of operations [transform sequences] and cost)

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent upon claim 5, Jeong further discloses:

a match between a source node and a target node, selecting said selected node transformation sequence to achieve a match, (p. 155 3rd sentence below Fig. 4 “The second step is to compute the minimum number of operations ...”), *where a first cost data loss for said match is than a second cost of data when deleting information contained in said source node, in a first iteration of matching.* (p. 155, 3.2.2 Tree matrix, especially the two paragraphs below Fig. 4 discussing computing of operations [transform sequences] and cost)

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent upon claim 6, Jeong further discloses:

matching said source node target node having a synonymous label to achieve said match. (p. 155 1st paragraph under 3.2.2 Tree Matrix re: computing distance between labeled trees and p. 155 3rd sentence below Fig. 4 “The second step is to compute the minimum number of operations ...”)

Regarding claim 8, which is dependent upon claim 5, Jeong further discloses:

wherein f) further comprises:

a match between a selecting said selected node transformation sequence when an associated cost of data loss is less than a second data loss when deleting source information contained in said source node and adding target information in said target node, second iteration of matching. (p. 155, 3.2.2 Tree matrix, especially the two paragraphs below Fig. 4 discussing computing of operations [transform sequences] and cost and the removal of nodes [in 2nd paragraph])

Regarding claim 9, which is dependent upon claim 5, Jeong further discloses:

wherein f) further comprises:

selecting said selected node transformation sequence of data loss. (p. 155, 3.2.2 Tree matrix, especially the two paragraphs below Fig. 4 discussing computing of operations [transform sequences] and cost)

Regarding independent claim 10, Jeong discloses:

A method of document transformation comprising:

a) modeling a source schema of XML and a target schema of XML as a tree structure creating a source tree and a target tree, source tree having a plurality of source nodes, said target tree having a plurality of target nodes; (Regarding source: p. 153 Table 4 re: row 1 and DTD “eg1”, Regarding target: p. 153 Table 4 re: row 1 and DTD “eg2”) and

b) generating a sequence of transformation operations that transforms said source XML document to said target XML document (p. 151 re: “(2) ... generate a set of tree grammar rules”), wherein said plurality of source nodes of said source schema are matched and transformed to said plurality of target nodes in said target schema. (p. 155, 3.2.2 Tree Matrix, re: “use of a ... matching method between two trees”)

Regarding claim 11, which is dependent upon claim 10, Jeong further discloses:

wherein b) comprises:

b1) each source node in said source tree, selecting a plurality of candidate nodes in said target tree that are possible matches; (p. 155 1st sentence below Fig. 4 “with all possible matchings ... identified”)

b2) for each source node in said source tree, generating a plurality of node transformation operations transforming to each of said plurality of candidate nodes; (p. 155 3rd sentence below Fig. 4 “The second step is to compute the minimum number of operations ...”) and

b3) for each source node in said source tree, selecting one of said plurality of node transformation operations forming a selected node transformation operation having the least associated cost of data loss. (p. 155, 3.2.2 Tree matrix, especially the two paragraphs below Fig. 4 discussing computing of operations [transform sequences] and cost)

Regarding claim 12, which is dependent upon claim 11, Jeong further discloses:

combining said selected node transformation operation for each of said source nodes matched to a target node a sequence of transformation operations that transforms said source schema to said target schema. (p. 151 re: “(2) ... generate a set of tree grammar rules”)

Regarding claim 13, which is dependent upon claim 10, Jeong further discloses:

wherein said source schema is a source document type definition (DTD) and said target schema a target DTD. (p. 153, Table 4, Row 1, source DTD = “eg1” and Target DTD = “eg2”)

Regarding claim 14, which is dependent upon claim 10, Jeong further discloses:

folding nodes in said source and target trees preprocessing phase to find one-to-one node matching. (p. 155, last three paragraphs of 3.2.2 Tree Matrix discuss “divide-and-conquer” subtree processing)

Regarding claim 15, which is dependent upon claim 10, Jeong further discloses:

merging nodes in said source and target trees preprocessing phase to find one-to-one node matching. (p. 155, 3.2.2 Tree Matrix, especially 2nd paragraph disclosing “(3) parent-child merging” and “(4) sibling merging”)

Regarding independent claim 18, Jeong discloses:

A computer system comprising:
a processor; (inherent in Fig. 1 of p. 152) and
a computer readable memory coupled to said processor and containing
program instructions that, when executed, implement a method of document
transformation (inherent in Fig. 1 of p. 152) comprising:
modeling a source document corresponding to a source schema as
a source tree having a plurality of source nodes; (p. 153 Table 4 re: row 1
and DTD "eg1")
modeling a target document corresponding to a target schema as a
target tree having a plurality of target nodes; (p. 153 Table 4 re: row 1
and DTD "eg2") and
generating a sequence of transformation operations that
transforms said source tree to said target tree. (p. 153 Table 4 re: row 1
and DTD "eg2")

Regarding claims 20-26, these claims are substantially similar to claims 3-9,
respectively, and therefore likewise rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 2, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over
Euna Jeong et al ("Induction of Integrated View for XML Data with Heterogeneous DTDs",
CIKM '01, Nov. 5-10, 2001, ACM 1-581 (13-436-3/01/0011), pp. 151-158, hereafter referred to

as “Jeong”) in view of Geiger et al (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143816, filed Dec. 11, 2000, hereafter referred to as “Geiger”).

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent upon claim 1, the limitations of claim 1 have been previously addressed.

However, Jeong does not explicitly disclose:

d) converting said sequence of transformation operations into an Extensible Stylesheet Language for Transformations (XSLT) script.

Geiger, though, discloses:

d) converting said sequence of transformation operations into an Extensible Stylesheet Language for Transformations (XSLT) script. ([0011], teaching the use of XSLT as an XML-based template language)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Geiger for the benefit of Jeong, because to do so would allow a programmer to use a flexible language like XML in constructing templates (or pattern matchers) having both declarative and imperative characteristics, as taught by Geiger in [0007] and [0011]. These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., XML document transformation.

Regarding claim 17, this claim is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

Regarding claim 19, this claim is substantially similar to claim 2, and therefore likewise rejected.

11. **Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Euna Jeong et al (“Induction of Integrated View for XML Data with Heterogeneous DTDs”, CIKM ‘01, Nov. 5-10, 2001, ACM 1-581 (13-436-3/01/0011), pp. 151-158, hereafter referred to as “Jeong”) in view of the “Oracle9i XML Reference, Release 1 (9.0.1)” (Part No. A88899-01, Oracle Corp., Redwood City, CA, Jun. 2001, pp. i to x and 1-30 to 1-33, hereafter referred to as “Oracle9i”).

Regarding claim 16, which is dependent upon claim 10, the limitations of claim 10 have been previously addressed.

Jeong further discloses:

performing transformation operations only once at a tree and said target tree with the following exceptions (p. 155, 1st paragraph below Fig. 4, discussing the computation of a “minimum number of operations”):

a relabel operation following an unfold operation; (p. 154, 3.1 Renamer, especially “element name can be renamed”)

said unfold operation following said relabel operation; (p. 155, last three paragraphs of 3.2.2 Tree Matrix, especially the last paragraph discussing node removal)

...

However, Jeong does not explicitly disclose:

said relabel operation performed between an attribute and an element following or followed by a deletion or an addition of a qmark quantifier node.

Oracle9i, though, discloses:

said relabel operation performed between an attribute and an element following or followed by a deletion or an addition of a qmark quantifier node. (p. "1-33" discloses the use of QMARK)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Oracle9i for the benefit of Jeong, because to do so would provide a programmer with an appropriate class member for identifying a qmark node type value in a DTD element declaration, as taught by Oracle9i on page "1-30". These references were all applicable to the same field of endeavor, i.e., XML document transformation.

Response to Declaration/Affidavit Under 37 CFR 1.131

12. The declaration filed on 4/26/2005 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the filing date of the Jeong reference ("Induction of Integrated View for XML Data with Heterogeneous DTDs").

The Applicant has submitted a declaration signed by Harumi Anne Kuno and supporting Exhibits A-C, consisting of (A) the cover page of an invention disclosure form signed by two of the three named inventors on or about 3/19/01 and labeled as "Page one of [blank]", (B) a witness signature sheet signed on 3/15/01 and labeled as "[blank] one of [blank]", and (C) an unnumbered page of typed descriptive material (purported a part of the invention disclosure). The declaration indicates that these three exhibits are all part of the same invention disclosure form.

The declaration of Harumi Anne Kuno under 37 CFR 1.131 is insufficient to overcome the Jeong reference. There are formalities issues and the evidence submitted is insufficient to establish conception and due diligence to constructive reduction to practice (i.e., filing).

Formalities

As set forth in MPEP 715.04, an affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 requires the signatures of all inventors, with certain exceptions that have not been established in the instant case. Only inventor Kuno has signed the declaration. This Rule 131 declaration is procedurally defective and therefore is insufficient for the purpose of antedating the Jeong reference.

In the interest of compact prosecution, the Office further notes the following deficiencies in the substance of the affidavit and proofs provided. Note that this is for guidance to the Applicant and is not necessarily comprehensive.

General considerations

It is not clear how Applicant is attempting to show prior invention. 37 CFR 1.131(b) sets forth three ways in which an Applicant can establish prior invention of the claimed subject matter. The showing of facts must be sufficient to show:

- a) reduction to practice of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference; or
- b) conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with the due diligence from prior to the reference date to a subsequent (actual) reduction to practice; or
- c) conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from prior to the reference date of the application (constructive reduction to practice).

The declaration is not clear as to whether applicants are relying on the evidence to show reduction to practice prior to the reference date or conception coupled with diligence.

The Office also notes that:

Art Unit: 2176

A general allegation that the invention was completed prior to the date of the reference is not sufficient. *Ex parte Saunders*, 1883 C.D. 23, 23 O.G. 1224 (Comm'r Pat. 1883). Similarly, a declaration by the inventor to the effect that his or her invention was conceived or reduced to practice prior to the reference date, without a statement of facts demonstrating the correctness of this conclusion, is insufficient to satisfy 37 CFR 1.131. (MPEP 715.07)

Additionally:

The affidavit or declaration and exhibits must clearly explain which facts or data Applicant is relying on to show completion of his or her invention prior to the particular date. Vague and general statements in broad terms about what the exhibits describe along with a general assertion that the exhibits describe a reduction to practice "amounts essentially to a mere pleading, unsupported by proof or a showing of the facts" and, thus, does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.131(b). *In re Borowski*, 505 F.2d 713, 184 USPQ 29 (CCPA 1974). Applicant must give a clear explanation of the exhibits pointing out exactly what facts are established and relied on by Applicant. 505 F.2d at 718-19, 184 USPQ at 33. See also *In re Harry*, 333 F.2d 920, 142 USPQ 164 (CCPA 1964) (Affidavit "asserts that facts exist but does not tell what they are or when they occurred.") (MPEP 715.07)

Evidence submitted

As evidence of actual reduction to practice and conception, Applicant merely presents Exhibits A-C, consisting of an invention disclosure form signed by two of the three named inventors on or about 3/19/01 and labeled as "Page one of [blank]", a witness signature sheet signed on 3/15/01 and labeled as "[blank] one of [blank]", and an unnumbered page of typed descriptive material (purported a part of the invention disclosure).

Conception

Applicant presents Exhibits A-C, and merely states that conception exists.

The Office notes that:

Conception is the mental part of the inventive act, but it must be capable of proof, as by drawings, complete disclosure to another person, etc. In *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1987 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897), it was established that conception is more than a mere vague idea of how to solve a problem; the means themselves and their interaction must be comprehended also. (MPEP 715.07)

The evidence provided is merely general allegation without demonstrating the correctness of Applicant's conclusion. Furthermore, Applicant has provided no clear explanation of the facts relied upon has been provided. Additionally, several claimed features do not appear to be supported by the single page invention description (i.e., Exhibit C). By way of example, and not to be construed as exhaustive, there are issues as to support of the description/implementation of claimed features based upon Exhibit C.

For instance: the exhibit mentions "Transformations", yet no criteria for performing such transformations are addressed; matching as implemented via the "MatchPropagate()" routine appears to be merely adding/deleting nodes (with no matching criteria indicated); claimed XSLT limitations does not appear in the exhibit; there is no implementation of "cost" (which is noted as appearing in another invention disclosure); and limiting performance of transformation operations to "once" and the criteria setting forth the exceptions thereto. Therefore, Applicant has not provided an adequate showing of conception.

Actual Reduction To Practice

Applicant presents Exhibits A-C, and merely states that reduction to practice exists.

The Office notes that:

In general, proof of actual reduction to practice requires a showing that the apparatus actually existed and worked for its intended purpose. (MPEP 715.07)

The evidence Applicant offers to show actual reduction to practice is merely a statement that the signing individual had something explained to the signing individual. There is nothing that ties the Applicant's purported invention to this statement (i.e., Exhibit B). Additionally, there is no explanation as to how reduction to practice is demonstrated by Applicant's mere presenting of the declaration Exhibits. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the invention was made and tested to demonstrate that it worked for its intended purpose. Therefore, Applicant has not provided an adequate showing of actual reduction to practice.

Diligence

In order to demonstrate diligence Applicant merely states that Applicant was diligent.

The Office notes:

Where conception occurs prior to the date of the reference, but reduction to practice is afterward, it is not enough merely to allege that Applicant or patent owner had been diligent. *Ex parte Hunter*, 1889 C.D. 218, 49 O.G. 733 (Comm'r Pat. 1889). Rather, Applicant must show evidence of facts establishing diligence. (MPEP 715.07)

In determining the sufficiency of a 37 CFR 1.131 affidavit or declaration, diligence need not be considered unless conception of the invention prior to the effective date is clearly established, since diligence comes into question only after prior conception is established. *Ex parte Kantor*, 177 USPQ 455 (Bd. App. 1958). (MPEP 715.07)

Applicant's mere statement that Applicant was diligent is insufficient to establish diligence. Therefore Applicant has not provided an adequate showing of due diligence.

Conclusion

In view of the above, the Office asserts that the declaration of Harumi Anne Kuno under 37 CFR 1.131 is insufficient to overcome the Jeong reference. Therefore the Office maintains the rejections of the claims raised in the FAOM under 35 USC 102(a) and 103(a) and relying upon Jeong.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the FAOM objections/rejections, the Office withdraws all non-prior art objections and rejections raised in the First Action on the Merits (FAOM), in view of the amendment (i.e., specification, 35 USC 112 1st and 2nd paragraphs).

Regarding the Rule 131 declaration, the Office has addressed this issue in the appropriately entitled section above.

Regarding the FAOM rejections of claims 1, 3-15, 18 and 20-26 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Jeong, Applicant argues on pages 19-22 that Jeong does not teach the use of schemas.

However, the Office notes that the use of the schemas is disclosed throughout the Jeong reference (e.g., Abstract, p. 152 Fig. 2 and preceding text disclosing “schema learner”, etc.). Furthermore, the p. 153 Table 4 shows source transformations to targets. The Office therefore

substantially maintains the FAOM rejections of claims 1, 3-15, 18 and 20-26 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Jeong, in view of the amendment, with modifications to accommodate any corresponding claim variance between the FAOM and amendment.

Regarding the FAOM rejections of claims 2, 17 and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeong in view of Geiger and claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeong in view of Oracle9i, Applicant argues on pages 22-23 that these rejections are incorrect due to Applicant's previously asserted Jeong deficiencies.

However, the Office has previously addressed Applicant's arguments vice Jeong above, and respectfully disagrees. The Office therefore substantially maintains the FAOM rejections of claims 2, 17 and 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeong in view of Geiger and claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeong in view of Oracle9i, in view of the amendment, with modifications to accommodate any corresponding claim variance between the FAOM and amendment.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Non-patent Literature

Claypool, Kajal T., et al., "Gangam – A Solution to Support Multiple Data Models, Their Mappings and Maintenance", ACM SIGMOD, May 21-24, 2001, Santa Barbara, CA, p. 606 [ACM 1-58113-332-4/01/05].

Su, Hong, et al., "Automating the Transformation of XML Documents", WIDM 2001, Nov. 2001, Atlanta, GA, pp. 68-75 (plus citation page) [ACM 1-58113-444-4/01/11].

Pietriga, Emmanuel, et al., "VXT: A Visual Approach to XML Transformations",
DocEng '01, Nov. 9-10, 2001, Atlanta, GA, pp. 1-10.

US Patent Application Publications

Gharavy

2003/0074181

US Patents

Su et al

6,845,380

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M Stevens whose telephone number is (571) 272-4102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00 - 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The current fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Additionally, the main number for Technology Center 2100 is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert M. Stevens
Reg. No. 47,972
Art Unit 2176
Date: July 8, 2005

rms

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
7/9/2005